



Carl A. Chase
1601 San Pablo Ave.
Seaside, CA 93955

MAILED

FEB 17 2011

OFFICE OF PETITIONS

In re Patent of Carl A. Chase Jr. :
Patent No. 6,076,213 :
Issue Date: June 20, 2000 :
Application No. 08/909,712 :
Filing Date: August 11, 1997 :
For: Portable Inflatable Massage :
Support Apparatus :

Decision on Petition

This is a decision on the petition under 37 C.F.R. § 1.378(b), filed January 14, 2011, to reinstate the above-identified patent.

The petition is **DISMISSED**.

Facts

Patent No. 6,076,213 issued June 20, 2000.

The 3.5 year maintenance fee was timely paid on November 20, 2003.

The 7.5 year maintenance fee could have been paid from June 20, 2007, to December 20, 2007, or with a surcharge from December 21, 2007, to June 20, 2008. The fee was not timely paid. As a result, the patent expired June 21, 2008.

The instant petition was filed January 14, 2011. The petition includes \$1,240 for the 7.5 year maintenance fee and \$700 for the surcharge set forth in 37 C.F.R. § 1.20(i)(1).

The petition states, "Due to the fact I was unemployed from June, 2007 to May 2009 I was unable to make this payment."

Law

A grantable petition under 37 C.F.R. § 1.378(b) must be accompanied by a showing to the satisfaction of the Director that the entire delay in paying the required maintenance fee from the

due date for the fee until the filing of a grantable petition pursuant to this paragraph was unavoidable.

In order for a party to show unavoidable delay, the party must show "reasonable care was taken to ensure that the maintenance fee would be promptly paid."¹ The level of "reasonable care" required to be shown is the same as the level of "care or diligence ... generally used and observed by prudent and careful men in relation to their most important business."² When determining if a period of delay has been shown to have been unavoidable, the Office will take "all the facts and circumstances into account" and will decide each petition "on a case-by-case basis."³

35 U.S.C. § 41(c)(1) states, with emphasis added, "The Director may accept the payment of any maintenance fee . . . after the six month grace period if the delay is *shown to the satisfaction of the Director* to have been unavoidable." Therefore, petitioner has the burden of proof.

The Office and Congress have recognized the unavoidable standard can be very difficult to meet. During 1992, Congress considered the difficulty involved in reinstating a patent under the unavoidable. Congressional representatives described the unavoidable standard as inflexible, extremely hard to meet, too stringent and harsh.⁴ Congress did NOT take steps to make the unavoidable standard more flexible, easier to meet, less stringent, or less harsh. Instead, Congress determined that it would allow patent owners the ability to reinstate a patent under an "unintentional" standard as long as the petition was filed within 24 months of the expiration of the patent. Congress chose to continue requiring proof of unavoidable delay for petitions filed after the 24 month time period.

Analysis

Petitioner appears to be asserting financial difficulties are the cause of the delay in the submission of the 7.5 year maintenance fee. A showing of "unavoidable" delay based upon financial difficulty must establish that petitioner lacked the financial resources to timely pay the fee at issue or to file a petition to reinstate earlier. Such a showing must be supported by a complete showing of the responsible person's financial condition during the entire period

¹ 37 C.F.R. § 1.378(b).

² *In re Mattulath*, 38 App. D.C. 497, 514-15 (D.C. Cir. 1912). See also *Ray v. Lehman*, 55 F.3d 606, 34 U.S.P.Q.2d (BNA) 1786 (Fed. Cir. 1995) (citations omitted) ("[I]n determining whether a delay in paying a maintenance fee was unavoidable, one looks to whether the party responsible for payment of the maintenance fee exercised the due care of a reasonably prudent person.")

³ *Smith v. Mossinghoff*, 671 F.2d 533, 538, 213 U.S.P.Q. (BNA) 977 (D.C. Cir. 1982).

⁴ "[The unavoidable] standard has been found to be extremely hard to meet. Some patent owners have lost their patent rights due to this inflexible standard." 138 CONG. REC. S16613, 16614 (September 30, 1992) (Rep. DeConcini) (emphasis added). "The unavoidable standard has proved to be too stringent in many cases." 138 CONG. REC. H1115 (October 3, 1992) (Rep. Hughes) (emphasis added). "The unavoidable standard is 'too stringent'. Some patent owners have lost their patent rights due to circumstances that do not warrant this harsh result, but that could not be considered 'unavoidable' under current law." 138 CONG. REC. E1688 (June 4, 1992) (extension of remarks of Rep. McCollum) (emphasis added).

between the last date the fee could have been timely paid (June 20, 2008) and the date the petition was filed (January 14, 2011), including income, expenses, assets, credit and obligations, which made the delay in payment of the maintenance fee unavoidable. The current record fails to provide financial information demonstrating Petitioner was unable to timely pay the fee and unable to file a petition to reinstate the patent on an earlier date. Therefore, the petition cannot be granted.

If a request for reconsideration is filed, the request should include a month by month analysis of income, expenses, and assets to establish the fact that petitioner could not have afforded to pay the maintenance fee on an earlier date. Petitioner should also provide copies of any documents or records that would confirm the financial difficulty.

A proper showing of unavoidable delay based on financial difficulty must demonstrate Petitioner treated the payment of the maintenance fee the same as he would treat his most important business. Therefore, if a request for reconsideration is filed, the request should fully discuss any expenses incurred between June 20, 2008, and January 14, 2011, which might be interpreted by the Office as an indication Petitioner did not treat the patent the same as he would treat his most important business.

Petitioner is cautioned to avoid submitting personal information in documents filed in a patent application that may contribute to identity theft. Personal information such as social security numbers, bank account numbers, or credit card numbers (other than a check or credit card authorization form PTO-2038 submitted for payment purposes) is never required by the USPTO to support a petition or an application. If this type of personal information is included in documents submitted to the USPTO, petitioners/applicants should consider redacting such personal information from the documents before submitting them to the USPTO. Petitioner/applicant is advised that the record of a patent application is available to the public after publication of the application (unless a non-publication request in compliance with 37 C.F.R. § 1.213(a) is made in the application) or issuance of a patent. Furthermore, the record from an abandoned application may also be available to the public if the application is referenced in a published application or an issued patent (see 37 C.F.R. § 1.14). Checks and credit card authorization forms PTO-2038 submitted for payment purposes are not retained in the application file and therefore are not publicly available.

In view of the prior discussion, the showing of record is not sufficient to establish that the entire delay was unavoidable within the meaning of 37 C.F.R. § 1.378(b).

The Address of Record

The file does not indicate a change of address has been submitted, although the address given on the petition differs from the address of record. The instant decision is being mailed to the address given on the petition; however, the Office will mail all future correspondence solely to the current address of record unless a request to change the address is filed. A form which can be used to request a change to the address of record is enclosed.

Petitioner's Current Options

I. Petitioner may file a request for reconsideration.

Any request for reconsideration must be submitted within TWO (2) MONTHS from the mail date of this decision and include a non-refundable petition fee of \$400. Extensions of time under 37 C.F.R. § 1.136(a) are NOT permitted. The reconsideration request should include a cover letter entitled "Renewed Petition under 37 CFR 1.378(b)." This is **not** a final agency action within the meaning of 5 U.S.C. § 704.

After a decision on the petition for reconsideration is issued, no further reconsideration or review of the matter will be undertaken by the Director. Therefore, it is extremely important that petitioner supply **any** and **all** relevant information and documentation with his request for reconsideration. The Commissioner's decision will be based solely on the administrative record in existence. Petitioner should remember that it is not enough that the delay was unavoidable; petitioner must prove that the delay was unavoidable. A petition will not be granted if petitioner provides insufficient evidence to "show" that the delay was unavoidable. Therefore, if a request for reconsideration is filed, it must establish that the entire delay in the submission of the maintenance fee was unavoidable.

II. Petitioner may request a refund of the maintenance fee and surcharge which accompanied the petition.

Since the petition is dismissed, petitioner may request a refund of the maintenance fee and surcharge. Petitioner is reminded that if a request for reconsideration is later filed along with the \$400 fee, the \$400 will not be refunded. A request for a refund should be sent to: Mail Stop 16, Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450. A copy of this decision should accompany any request for refund.

Further correspondence with respect to this matter may be submitted as follows:

By Internet: A request for reconsideration may be filed electronically using EFS Web.⁵
Document Code "PET.OP" should be used if the request is filed electronically.

By mail: Mail Stop Petition
Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

By facsimile: (571) 273-8300
Attn: Office of Petitions

⁵ General Information concerning EFS Web can be found at <http://www.uspto.gov/patents/process/file/efs/index.jsp>.

Telephone inquiries regarding this communication should be directed to Petitions Attorney Steven Brantley at (571) 272-3203.

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'C. Brantley', written in a cursive style.

Charles Steven Brantley
Senior Petitions Attorney
Office of Petitions

Enclosure: Form PTO/SB/123

Under the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995, no persons are required to respond to a collection of information unless it displays a valid OMB control number.

CHANGE OF CORRESPONDENCE ADDRESS Patent

Address to:
Mail Stop Post Issue
Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Patent Number

Issue Date

Application Number

Filing Date

First Named Inventor

Attorney Docket
Number

Please change the Correspondence Address for the above-identified patent to:

☐

The address associated with Customer Number:

OR

☐Firm or
Individual Name**Address**

City

State

ZIP

Country

Telephone

Email

This form cannot be used to change the data associated with a Customer Number. To change the data associated with an existing Customer Number use "Request for Customer Number Data Change" (PTO/SB/124).

This form will not affect any "fee address" provided for the above-identified patent. To change a "fee address" use the "Fee Address Indication Form" (PTO/SB/47).

I am the:

☐

Patentee.

☐

Assignee of record of the entire interest. See 37 CFR 3.71.
Statement under 37 CFR 3.73(b) is enclosed. (Form PTO/SB/96).

☐

Attorney or agent of record. Registration Number _____

Signature

Typed or
Printed Name

Date

Telephone

NOTE: Signatures of all the inventors or assignees of record of the entire interest or their representative(s) are required. Submit multiple forms if more than one signature is required, see below*.

☐

*Total of _____ forms are submitted.

This collection of information is required by 37 CFR 1.33. The information is required to obtain or retain a benefit by the public which is to file (and by the USPTO to process) an application. Confidentiality is governed by 35 U.S.C. 122 and 37 CFR 1.11 and 1.14. This collection is estimated to take 3 minutes to complete, including gathering, preparing, and submitting the completed application form to the USPTO. Time will vary depending upon the individual case. Any comments on the amount of time you require to complete this form and/or suggestions for reducing this burden, should be sent to the Chief Information Officer, U.S. Patent and Trademark Office, U.S. Department of Commerce, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450. DO NOT SEND FEES OR COMPLETED FORMS TO THIS ADDRESS. **SEND TO: Mail Stop Post Issue, Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450.**

If you need assistance in completing the form, call 1-800-PTO-9199 and select option 2.

Privacy Act Statement

The Privacy Act of 1974 (P.L. 93-579) requires that you be given certain information in connection with your submission of the attached form related to a patent application or patent. Accordingly, pursuant to the requirements of the Act, please be advised that: (1) the general authority for the collection of this information is 35 U.S.C. 2(b)(2); (2) furnishing of the information solicited is voluntary; and (3) the principal purpose for which the information is used by the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office is to process and/or examine your submission related to a patent application or patent. If you do not furnish the requested information, the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office may not be able to process and/or examine your submission, which may result in termination of proceedings or abandonment of the application or expiration of the patent.

The information provided by you in this form will be subject to the following routine uses:

1. The information on this form will be treated confidentially to the extent allowed under the Freedom of Information Act (5 U.S.C. 552) and the Privacy Act (5 U.S.C. 552a). Records from this system of records may be disclosed to the Department of Justice to determine whether disclosure of these records is required by the Freedom of Information Act.
2. A record from this system of records may be disclosed, as a routine use, in the course of presenting evidence to a court, magistrate, or administrative tribunal, including disclosures to opposing counsel in the course of settlement negotiations.
3. A record in this system of records may be disclosed, as a routine use, to a Member of Congress submitting a request involving an individual, to whom the record pertains, when the individual has requested assistance from the Member with respect to the subject matter of the record.
4. A record in this system of records may be disclosed, as a routine use, to a contractor of the Agency having need for the information in order to perform a contract. Recipients of information shall be required to comply with the requirements of the Privacy Act of 1974, as amended, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 552a(m).
5. A record related to an International Application filed under the Patent Cooperation Treaty in this system of records may be disclosed, as a routine use, to the International Bureau of the World Intellectual Property Organization, pursuant to the Patent Cooperation Treaty.
6. A record in this system of records may be disclosed, as a routine use, to another federal agency for purposes of National Security review (35 U.S.C. 181) and for review pursuant to the Atomic Energy Act (42 U.S.C. 218(c)).
7. A record from this system of records may be disclosed, as a routine use, to the Administrator, General Services, or his/her designee, during an inspection of records conducted by GSA as part of that agency's responsibility to recommend improvements in records management practices and programs, under authority of 44 U.S.C. 2904 and 2906. Such disclosure shall be made in accordance with the GSA regulations governing inspection of records for this purpose, and any other relevant (i.e., GSA or Commerce) directive. Such disclosure shall not be used to make determinations about individuals.
8. A record from this system of records may be disclosed, as a routine use, to the public after either publication of the application pursuant to 35 U.S.C. 122(b) or issuance of a patent pursuant to 35 U.S.C. 151. Further, a record may be disclosed, subject to the limitations of 37 CFR 1.14, as a routine use, to the public if the record was filed in an application which became abandoned or in which the proceedings were terminated and which application is referenced by either a published application, an application open to public inspection or an issued patent.
9. A record from this system of records may be disclosed, as a routine use, to a Federal, State, or local law enforcement agency, if the USPTO becomes aware of a violation or potential violation of law or regulation.